

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-23, 25-50, 52-78 and 80-90 are pending in the present application. By this reply, claims 24, 51 and 79 have been cancelled and claims 85-90 have been added. Claims 1, 28, 55 and 88-90 are independent claims.

Allowable Subject Matter/New Claims

Claims 24-25, 51-52 and 79-80 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form comprising all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, allowable claims 24, 51 and 79 have been rewritten in independent form and are presented herein as new claims 88-90, respectively. As a result, claims 24, 51 and 79 have been cancelled.

Furthermore, new dependent claims 85-87 are allowable at least for the same reasons that their independent claims are allowable as discussed below. In the alternative, these claims recite features (e.g., retrieving meta data depending on different roles of a user) that are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art of record.

Thus, it is respectfully requested that all the new claims should be indicated as allowable.

35 U.S.C. §§ 112 Rejections

Claims 6, 33 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 13, 40 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, fourth paragraph, for not incorporating all the limitations of the claims on which they depend. These claims have been reviewed and revised to clarify the invention and to overcome these rejections. Accordingly, the rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejections

Claims 1-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 28-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 55-57, 59, 77 and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being indefinite by Dedrick (U.S. Patent No. 5,710,884). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claims 1, 28 and 55, Dedrick is directed to a system for collecting end-user profile information and using it to provide customized electronic information to an end-user. The content adapter 25 in an end-user device as shown in Fig. 2 of Dedrick modifies the electronic information (e.g., advertisements on web pages or pop-ups) based on the end-user's profile information. However, Dedrick's customization of information does not vary depending on the different contexts of using the end-user device (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 45-47). For instance, in Dedrick, the user's preferred font size, as part of the end-user profile information that has been collected, is used always to display all web sites for that user.

However, this scheme in Dedrick is actually one of the problems that Applicants' invention addresses (see, e.g., paragraphs [0007] and [0008] of the present specification). In Applicants' invention, meta data that would be most appropriate for each of different contexts of using the computing device are retrieved from the user's meta data collection, as required by independent claims 1, 28 and 55. For instance, as set forth at paragraph [0081] of the present specification, the retrieval interface 18 in Applicants' device sets search criteria that represent the current context of filing in a form with different weights given to different context properties such as user role, URL, etc. So if the user is filling out a form as an employee, meta data for the form that would be most appropriate for that context would be retrieved. If the same user is filling out a form as a private citizen (personal use), meta data for the form that would be most appropriate for that context would be retrieved.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 5-6, 32-33 and 60-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. Patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Nguyen (U.S. Patent No. 5,638,448). Claims 7-9 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,546,002 B1). Claims 12, 14-16, 39 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Bull et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,901,287). Claims 13 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Bull et al. as applied to claims 12, 14-16, 39 and 41-43 above, and further in view of Kim. Claims 18 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Mohan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,505,230 B1). Claims 19 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Chun et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0184527 A1). Claims 23 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Nagahara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,246 B1). Claims 26, 53, 58, 65-66, 72, 75-76 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of the article entitled "Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce for Everyone a Step Further" (hereinafter as "Net Security Standard article"). Claims 27, 54 and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Charisius et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0077842 A1). Claims 62-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of the Net Security Standard article as applied to claims 26, 53, 58, 65-66, 72, 75-76 and 81, above, and further in view of Kim. Claims 67 and 69-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of the Net Security Standard article as applied to claims 26, 53, 58, 65-66, 72, 75-76 and 81 above, and in further view of Bull et al. Claim 68 is rejected

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of the Net Security Standard article in further view of Bull et al. as applied to claims 67 and 69-72 above, and further in view of Kim. Claim 73 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of the Net Security Standard article as applied to claims 26, 53, 58, 65-66, 72, 75-76 and 81 above, and further in view of Mohan et al. Claim 74 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of the Net Security Standard article as applied to claims 26, 53, 58, 65-66, 72, 75-76 and 81 above and in further view of Chun et al. Claim 84 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of the Net Security Standard article as applied to claims 26, 53, 58, 65-66, 72, 75-76 and 81 above, and further in view of Lim et al. (U.S. Patent 6,728,843 B1). These rejections, insofar as they pertain to the presently pending claims, are respectfully traversed.

As discussed hereinabove, Dedrick does not teach or suggest at least the above-identified features recited in independent claims 1, 28 and 55 from which claims 2-23, 26-27, 29-50, 53-54, 56-78, and 81-84 depend. Furthermore, none of the other references applied by the Examiner correct these deficiencies of Dedrick, and thus, make the claimed invention obvious over Dedrick. Thus, even if the references were combinable, assuming *arguendo*, the combinations of references as applied by the Examiner would still fail to teach or suggest the invention as recited in claims 1, 28 and 55 since the secondary reference(s) do not teach or suggest the claimed features that are missing from Dedrick.

Accordingly, the invention as recited in claims 1, 28 and 55 and their dependent claims (due to their dependency) is patentable over the applied references, and the rejections should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and earnestly solicit an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Should there be any matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Esther H. Chong (Registration No. 40,953) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 09/0461 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By Esther H. Chong #40,953
Esther H. Chong, #40,953

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22032-0747
(703) 205-8000

EHC:sld